

REMARKS

This Request for Reconsideration is filed in response to the Office Action of September 26, 2006 in which claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentably obvious over Bridgelall (U.S. 6,717,516) in view of Hall et al (U.S. 2004/0203352).

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner is referred to the applicant's remarks contained on pages 7 and 8 of the amendment filed May 8, 2006 where it was pointed out that Bridgelall does not show a transceiver that adapts itself to operate as an RF tag reader or as a Bluetooth transceiver by changing its reception and transmission capabilities. The reasons given there are still valid.

Please see the enclosed Declaration under Rule 131 in which Tommy Ginman makes a declaration of certain facts that establish a date of invention prior to the Hall et al reference filed June 18, 2002.

Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 1-16 is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Francis J. Maguire
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 31,391

FJM/mo
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, Connecticut 06468
(203) 261-1234